

REMARKS

Claims 4, 12, 16 and 20-23 are cancelled.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-15, 17-19 and 24-25 are pending.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-15, and 17-19 are rejected.

The final office action dated April 1, 2009 indicates that claim 17 is rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because “at the input device” lacks antecedent basis. Page 7 of the office action indicates that claim 17 contains allowable subject matter and would be allowed if amended to overcome the ‘112 rejection. The ‘112 rejection has been overcome by the amendment above to claim 17. Claim 17 and its dependent claims 18-19 should now be allowed.

The final office action indicates that claims 24 and 25 are withdrawn from consideration. These claims have been cancelled.

The final office action indicates that claims 1-2, 7-10 and 13-15 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 12-13 and 15-16 of U.S. Patent No. 7,212,882. This rejection has been overcome by the attached terminal disclaimer.

The final office action indicates that claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-15 remain rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Csipkes U.S. Patent No. 6,188,402. We respectfully disagree with the ‘102 rejection. However, the ‘102 rejection has been rendered moot by the amendments above. Base claims 1 and 9 have been amended to recite the allowable subject matter of claim 17. Claims 5-6 and 13-14 have been cancelled. Amended base claims 1 and 9 and their dependent claims should now be allowed.

The terminal disclaimer and amendments above should place the application in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to discuss any remaining issues prior to mailing another office action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hugh Gortler #33,890/
Hugh P. Gortler
Reg. No. 33,890
(949) 454-0898

Date: June 8, 2009